

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36581

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 327
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: January 27, 2010
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
JANE DOE,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and suspended unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before LANSING, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;  
and MELANSON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

Jane Doe pled guilty to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). The district court withheld judgment and placed Doe on probation for three years. Doe subsequently violated her probation, and the district court ordered that she participate in the mental health court program. Doe was thereafter terminated from the mental health program. The district court determined that Doe had again violated the terms of her probation and revoked her withheld judgment. The district court imposed a sentence of a unified term of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, but retained jurisdiction. Following completion of

her period of retained jurisdiction, Doe was again placed on probation. Doe appeals, challenging the excessiveness of her sentence.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Doe's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.